

Application No. 10/524,105
Amendment dated August 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006

Docket No.: 2927-0185PUS1

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the attached Replacement Sheet containing amended Fig. 6 for the original drawing sheet containing Fig. 6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

With the entry of this Amendment, claims 2, 3 and 4 will be pending in this patent application.

OBJECTION TO DRAWINGS

To obviate the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicants are submitting herewith a Replacement Sheet with Fig. 6 amended by adding a PRIOR ART label. No new matter is introduced by this amendment to the drawings.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in original claim 5. In this paper, Applicant is amending claim 3 to incorporate the subject matter that was recited in claims 1 and 5 and is canceling claims 1 and 5. In other words, original claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form as amended claim 3. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 3.

Applicant trusts that the Examiner will find claims 2, 3 and 4, as now presented, to be allowable.

PRIOR ART REJECTION I

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/29270 A (Brenner et al.).

Applicant submits that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments to the claims made in this paper.

PRIOR ART REJECTION II

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2003/0014199 A1 (Toomey).

Applicant submits that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments to the claims made in this paper.

PRIOR ART REJECTION III

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brenner et al. or Toomey in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Applicant submits that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments to the claims made in this paper.

PRIOR ART REJECTION IV

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toomey in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Applicant submits that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments to the claims made in this paper.

OTHER PRIOR ART

Applicants have considered the other prior art cited by the Examiner. Applicant is not commenting on this prior art, because it was not applied against the claims in this application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments, observations and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection and the rejections stated in the outstanding Office Action and recognize all of the pending claims as allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Frederick R. Handren, Reg. No. 32,874, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/524,105
Amendment dated August 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006


Docket No.: 2927-0185PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (Fig. 6)